7/2/70

Dear Ed,

Hasty response to the thins you raise in your 6/30:

Huie's book is not all hooey. That compulsion all the finks have (in varying degree), for self-justification, has led him into the revelation of things the significance of which, I believe, is lost upon him. I have every hope he may receive the full benefit of them e'er too long. Aside from the bad reviews, it is also a bad book, one not worthy of good sale and I predict poor sales.

I've not yet seen a copy of the Nichols suit. I hope it is better prepared than the one he ultimately withdrew. That one cost me enough time for the writing of a book in my efforts to salvage him. John is very well intentioned, but one of the characters on our side -and arrogant as hell.

Wecht is great, and he can be brilliant. If you, by any chance, taped that Long John show, I'd like to borrow the tape long enough to hear it. I understand he rather enjoys doing Long John when he is in NYC.

Sprague also is sincere as man can be, and about as wrong. He will not listen to what is uncongenial to his preconceptions and is not nearly as well or as accurately informed as he thinks he is. He is not alone in this, alas, and those who see conspiracies in stones and plots in rivulets are all in contact with each other, feeding each other awful crap.

Kirkwood is a pro, but on Shaw he is as biased as Garrison is on the other side. It is my understanding that Kirkwood, like Shaw, is homosexual, which would perhaps incline K to be more sympathetic. I found his piece in Esquire as sickening as some of what is supposed to be "our side", and no less undependable. Some of it was atrocious, like the crack about compromising the lady's honor.

On Shaw: I have never believed he was part of the plot, have always had some doubts about Russo, as far back as when I wrote Oswald in New Orleans, and never did my Shaw investigation as such when I was in N.O. However, I am also persuaded he commited perjuries other than Garrison charged him with, and I must ask myself why a man completely innocent would do such a thing. I have, from the first, felt he is Clay Bertrand, and my own interviews with Dean Andrews did nothing to discourage this belief. I believe it likely he had CIA connections, which is not, in itself, a cuplablex thing.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg